COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 525
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-2766
PHONE: (213) 974-8301 FAX: (213) 626-5427

J. TYLER McCAULEY
AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

June 4, 2002

To: Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky, Chairman
Supervisor Gloria Molina
Supervisor Yvonne Brathwaite Burke
Supervisor Don Knabe
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: J. Tyler McCauley
Auditor-Controller

Subject: **PEDESTRIAN ROUTE MAPPING PROGRAM FOR TRAFFIC AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY SECOND FOLLOW UP REVIEW**

At the request of the Third District, we conducted a second follow up review on the Department of Public Works (DPW or Department) proposal evaluation process used for the Pedestrian Route Mapping Program for Traffic and Pedestrian Safety (Pedestrian) contract. The purpose of our follow up review was to examine the process used by the evaluation committee to re-evaluate the proposals for the Pedestrian contract.

As part of our follow up review, we interviewed a member of the evaluation committee and reviewed documents related to the contracting process, including the completed evaluation rating instruments and proposal summary scores.

Background

On March 5, 2002, we issued our initial report on our review of DPW's proposal evaluation process for the Pedestrian contract. Our report noted a number of areas where the evaluation process could have been conducted in a more objective, accurate and documented manner. We recommended the proposals be re-evaluated with a new evaluation committee using the evaluation process described in the RFP.

On April 29, 2002, we issued a follow up report that noted DPW had re-evaluated the written proposals for the Pedestrian contract using a new evaluation team composed of two DPW staff and one individual from the Los Angeles County Office of Education. In addition, we noted that the evaluation team followed the evaluation process described in the solicitation documents.

Results of Review

In our initial report, we recommended that the Department ensure that the evaluation committee members meet and attempt to resolve any significant scoring differences between their individual scoring and explain any unresolved differences. Although we verified that the current evaluation team met to discuss significant scoring differences, we noted that the committee did not document the rationale for their unresolved scoring differences. For example, some evaluators assigned zero points to specific evaluation criterion, while the other evaluators assigned maximum points (or almost maximum points) for the same criterion for the same proposal (Table 1).

Table 1
Department of Public Works
Pedestrian Route Mapping Program
Summary of Evaluator Scores

Proposal	Question (max points)	Eval 1	Eval 2	Eval 3
Wildan	#5 (25pts)	13	20	0
Civic Technologies	#8 (5pts)	5	5	0
Katz, Okitsu & Assoc	#8 (5pts)	5	5	0
Psomas	#8 (5pts)	5	5	0
Absolute Internet	#10 (5pts)	4	0	5
Wildan	#10 (5pts)	4	0	5
Psomas	#10 (5pts)	5	0	5

In addition, we noted that the evaluators did not always provide written comments to support their assigned scores. Approximately 50% of the evaluation criterion did not include evaluator's comments, even though the evaluation instrument provided adequate space for comments. As a result, we were unable to determine the evaluators' basis for many of their assigned scores.

DPW management needs to reconvene the evaluation committee to resolve the significant scoring differences noted above. If significant scoring differences still occur, the Department needs to ensure that evaluation committee members provide written comments to explain the unresolved differences.

Recommendations

DPW management:

1. **Reconvene the evaluation committee to resolve the significant scoring differences noted above. If significant scoring differences still occur, the Department ensure that evaluation committee members provide written comments to explain the unresolved differences.**

2. **For future solicitations, ensure that evaluation committee members provide written comments that support their assigned scores for the evaluation criterion.**

If you have any questions, please contact me or your staff may contact DeWitt Roberts at (213) 974-0301.

JTM:DR:DC

c: David E. Janssen, Chief Administrative Officer
Violet Varona-Lukens, Executive Officer
Department of Public Works
James A Noyes, Director
James T. Sparks, Assistant Deputy Director
Ray Low, Internal Audit
Public Information Office
Audit Committee